

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Minutes

May 10, 2007
Salisbury, North Carolina

The Historic Preservation Commission for the City of Salisbury met in regular session on Thursday, May 10, 2007, in the Council Chambers at the City Hall, 217 S. Main Street.

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman, Wayne Whitman. In addition to Wayne Whitman, the following members were present and introduced themselves: Jack Errante, Ronald Fleming, Susan Hurt, Judy Kandl, Anne Lyles, and Anne Waters, Kathy Walters. Mr. Whitman welcomed all persons present and read the meeting's purpose and procedures.

Swearing-in of New Member

Wayne Whitman administered the oath of office to the Commission's new member, Deborah Johnson. She was welcomed by Commission members and seated.

Requests for Certificates of Occupancy

Janet Gapen opened the hearing with information from an excerpt found in Sect. 18 of the Salisbury Code of Ordinance pertaining to Historic Preservation Commissions. She stated that because of questions raised at the last HPC meeting she wanted to refresh memories about what is within the review capacity of the Commission which also goes along with the Historic District Design Guidelines. Ms. Gapen read from Section 18.10 *Criteria to Determine Appropriateness*.

H-17-07 122 E. Innes St. – Michael & Connie Baker, owner

Request: Installation of custom gate for privacy and to keep amount of debris that enters hallway to entrance of building.

Michael & Connie Baker were sworn to give testimony for the request.

Mr. Baker informed the Commission that the old Flowers Bakery building has been through rehabilitation. He stated that there are entrances on the Bernhardt parking lot side and a large opening for the entry way into the building. He testified that he would like to install a metal gate in the existing 10' long and 10' tall opening which was put in as a handicap access. The gate will be made of all metal with a clear acrylic on the inside of the framework that will help to keep out the debris.

In response to a question from Judy Kandl, Mr. Baker testified that the metal for the door would be steel with either a beige trim or rustic ironwork.

Ms. Kandl referred the members to Chapter 2.4 Materials & Details in order to evaluate the proposed door in terms of the building, scale and scope of the building, which she described as being quite large. She also stated that they should consider the guidelines from Chapter 2.45 Architectural Metals which talks about building historical character.

Janet Gapen read from Chapter 2.4.1 (4) Architectural Details & Ornamentation which reads: *If the entire architectural detail is missing, design the replacement feature based on historic documentation. If there is no documentation, but evidence that the element was originally on the building, any new design should be compatible with the historic character of the building and district.*

She also read 2.4.5 (3) Architectural Metals which reads: *Retain and preserve historic metal fabric whenever possible. If replacement is necessary, use new metal that matches the original in composition, dimension, shape, detail and texture. Consider substitute material only if the original material is not technically feasible.*

Kathy Walters noted that in the guidelines also states that *cast iron, wrought iron, copper, tin, sheet metal, aluminum, steel, and bronze are all traditional architectural metals that contribute to the architectural character of historic buildings through their distinctive forms, finishes, and details.*

Anne Waters asked Mr. Baker if he had considered a heavy storm grade of glass instead of the flexi-glass. Mr. Baker stated that type glass would probably add substantially to the weight, which was not needed.

Susan Hurt referred the members to the guidelines for Windows and Doors, guideline 10: *.....Keep new windows and doors compatible with existing units in proportion, shape, positioning, location, size, materials and details.*

There was no one present to speak in support or opposition to the request.

With no other comments or questions from Commission members, Jack Errante made the following motion: "I move that the Commission find the following facts concerning Application #H-17-07 – that Michael & Connie Baker, owners of 122 E. Innes St. appeared before the Commission and sought a Certificate of Appropriateness to install a custom gate for privacy and keep out debris that enters the hallway through the entrance of the building; that no one appeared before the Commission to support or oppose this request, this request should be granted based on The Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation and Chapter 4 – Site Features and District Settings - Windows and Doors, pages 30-31, guidelines 1-12 of the Non-Residential Historic District Design Guidelines; there were no mitigating factors; therefore, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application #H-17-07 be granted to Michael & Connie Baker, owners of 122 E. Innes St., to make the changes detailed in the application."

Kathy Walters seconded the motion; all members present voted AYE.

H-18-07 414 W. Fisher St. – Edward & Susan Norvell, owner

Request: Replace outdoor light fixture with one more appropriate to the period – high model - artistic lighting - clear glass; White painted wooden post.

Susan Norvell was sworn to give testimony for the request.

Mrs. Norvell testified that they would like to upgrade the existing light fixture and pole located at 414 W. Fisher St. She described the free-standing electric light, which is called Brass Point Lantern, to be charcoal in color with clear glass. The post, painted White, will be similar to those along the right-of-way on Bank Street in size and shape.

There was no one present to speak in support or opposition to the request.

Anne Lyles made the following motion” “I move that the Commission find the following facts concerning Application #H-18-07 – that Susan Norvell, owner of 414 W. Fisher St., appeared before the Commission and sought a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the outdoor light fixture with one more appropriate to the period – high model with artistic lighting, clear glass on a White painted post; that no one appeared before the Commission to support or oppose this request, this request should be granted based on The Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation, and Chapter 4 Site Features and District Setting – Lighting, pages 54-55, guidelines 1-5 of the Residential Historic District Design Guidelines; there were no mitigating factors; therefore, I further move that a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application #H-18-07 be granted to Edward & Susan Norvell, owner of 414 W. Fisher St., to make changes detailed in the application.”

Susan Hurt seconded the motion; all members present voted AYE.

H-19-07 1432 N. Lee St. – Spencers, Inc., owner

Request: Construction of new construction office and shop

Richard Bostic and Glenn Stowe, were sworn in to give testimony for the request. Staff presented slides.

Staff presented slides of the site where a new office and shop would be constructed, as Wendy Spry described the pictures. She stated that the lot is zoned M-1.

Mr. Stowe presented the floor plan of the 2300 sq. ft office building. He described it as a simple office with a brick façade. An exposed structural steel sign will be located over the front of the building with the company name in it. The windows, he stated, would be all plate glass; the window frame and door frame will be a bronze colored aluminum. In response to a question from Jack Errante, he stated that the building will be approximately 16 ft. in height.

Mr. Stowe testified that the 4000 sq. ft. shop, located 24 ft. off the alley, will be concrete 12” block, painted Sandstone, which is a beige color. The shop will be used for storage, and will have two 14x14 ft. roll-up doors; the main door will be an industrial metal door.

Mr. Stowe continued with the presentation of the landscape plan which includes 13 pecan trees and a sweet-gum tree. He stated that the trees are planted about 22 ft. apart. Crepe Myrtles will also be planted as per the guidelines. In addition, he testified that there are about 3 or 4 trees on the lot that they intend to keep. Mr. Bostic noted that some of the existing trees are not very healthy.

From the slides, Mr. Stowe showed the location for an 8-ft dog-ear fence that will look similar to the dumpster enclosure located in the parking lot. The fence will run down the alley, turn toward the building about 3-7 ft. off 14th St. and then into the side of the office. From there a chain link fence will begin on the other side of the office that will face the truck lot and down Lee St.

In response to a question from Kathy Walters, Mr. Stowe stated that on N. Lee St, the plantings are located on the inside of the fence.

Judy Kandl asked Mr. Stowe to describe why the buildings are where they are on the site.

Mr. Stowe explained that the locations make the best use of the site for what they do; it puts the office down on 14th St. where it can be used as a screen against the existing church, and it allows for a big open area with a u-shape yard that can be easily maneuvered around which is needed for some of their large sized equipment.

Judy Kandl informed Mr. Stowe that it would be wise for them to consider professional help with the design of the building as well as the landscaping. She explained that the buildings in the neighborhood that were used for details may not be as historic or have details quite old enough to use as a pattern. She further suggested that they take a look at some of the newer buildings that have been renovated or built in the downtown area, such as the Fisher-Harris building.

Mr. Stowe responded by saying, "Basically, what you see there is what we'll build." He stated that the design staff which they plan to use would be more for answering their own technical questions for them.

Wendy Spry stated that the submitted plan does accommodate all DRAC recommendations.

Susan Hurt informed Mr. Stowe that chain link fencing is not allowed unless it is grandfathered, which means it was there before the district became a historic district and can remain until it comes down and then cannot be replaced. She read from the fencing and walls guideline.

Jack Errante asked why a chain link fence is proposed for the sides of the building, and wood on just one side.

Mr. Stowe stated that he thinks the chain link fence is more secure and calls for less maintenance. The wood fence would be used for the landscaping requirements which call for a 6 ft. fence, although they will install an 8 ft. fence. He further stated that they are trying to upgrade the areas which would be more visible.

In response to a question Judy Kandl, Mr. Stowe stated that the company's trucks would access from both the easement and from Lee St.

Judy Kandl commented that that the project is big but on a small lot, and will have a big impact on the neighborhood because there is a strong residential backdrop. She asked Mr. Stowe if he had considered planting the trees and then installing the fence so that the neighbors could get the better view.

Mr. Stowe stated that the existing vacant lot is being used by the neighboring residents and are using the existing vacant lot as a private back drive; if they put in a green space with a fence behind it, the green space would continually be used by the neighbors and the effect of the landscaping would be lost. Mr. Bostic further stated that the green space is also needed for runoff.

Anne Waters asked if iron might be a possibility for the fence; however, Mr. Stowe said an iron fence would not be very secure. He stated that with kids around they have to consider liability issues.

Wayne Whitman reminded Mr. Stowe that the Commission has to abide with the guidelines.

Wendy Spry informed the Commission that the proposal for the chain link fencing was briefly discussed in the DRAC meeting. The applicants were told to present the proposal and see what the Commission would say about it. She reminded Commission members that approval had been granted a while back for the extension of a pre-existing chain link fence at an adjacent property. Ms. Spry complimented the applicants on their desire to do things to better the neighborhood and how they have kept everyone in mind when planning the site.

Mr. Stowe stated that he plans to plant holly bushes along the fence line in front of the church and azaleas along the wall in front of 14th St. He further stated that he would not have a problem with planting ivy at the base of the chain link fence and allow it to crawl the fence in order to create the appearance of a hedge row.

Jack Errante commented that if a chain link fence is installed then everything that is within could encourage vandalism since it would be easily observed. However, Anne Lyles stated that being able to see what is inside the fence, especially by the police, could cause a safer type security than a wood fence.

Janet Gapen suggested to the Commission that in respect for time and to help move along with the request, they could consider the option of forming a committee which would mean that the decision be made at the next meeting.

Kathy Walters asked if they could approve the building and form a committee to study the guidelines for the fencing and landscape issues.

Judy Kandl stated that typically the entrance to a building on the street is on the front facing the street but the entrances for this particular are at both ends. Wendy Spry explained that their main entrance is addressed from Lee St. rather than 14th St.

Judy Kandl also questioned the proposal for exterior lighting.

Mr. Stowe stated that lights on the office building would only light the entrance doorways; the flood lights will light the 14 ft. shop doors, and halogen lamps will be mounted on the shop facing the yard.

Jerry Davis, Century 21 sales representative for the applicant, was sworn to make comments in support of the request. Mr. Davis stated that the plans that have been presented by Mr. Stowe are far better than those presented by another prospective buyer of the property.

Kenny Nottingham, 1439 N. Lee St., was sworn to speak in opposition of the request. He testified that his concerns have to do with the safety of his child. Mr. Stowe responded “No” when Mr. Nottingham asked if there would be a lot of trucks running in and out.

Gray Stout, 5 Acorn Lane, was sworn to speak in opposition to the request. He stated that the horizontal proportion of the windows is not appropriate for the district and that the building would be more appropriately placed if the front door faced 14th St. Mr. Stout also suggested a black vinyl chain link fence rather than the silver.

Kathy Walters asked Mr. Stowe if he would be willing to change the proportion of the windows and the color of the chain link fence as suggested by Mr. Stout. Mr. Stowe said he would not have a problem with the suggested changes.

Kathy Walters made the following motion: “I move that the Commission find the following facts concerning Application H-19-07 – that Glenn Stowe and Richard Bostic, potential owners of 1432 N. Lee St., appeared before the Commission and sought a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a new construction office and shop on the vacant property; that Kenny Nottingham and Gray Stout appeared before the Commission to oppose this request, and Jim Davis spoke in support of the request; this request should be granted based on The Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation and Chapter 3 – New Construction and Additions, pages 46-49, New Construction guidelines 1-17 of the Non-Residential Historic District Design Guidelines; no mitigating factors; therefore, I further move that a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application #H-19-07 be granted to Glenn Stowe and Richard Bostic to make the changes detailed in the application with the following changes agreed to by the applicants – that the windows in the office area be changed to a vertical orientation more compatible with similar structures and that the chain link fence will be a black vinyl coated chain link rather than silver.”

Commission members Jack Errante, Ronald Fleming, Deborah Johnson, Anne Lyles, Kathy Walters, and Wayne Whitman voted AYE; members Susan Hurt, Judy Kandl, and Anne Waters voted NO.

H-20-07 420 W. Bank St. – Stuart Lutterloh & Debra Lutterloh, owner

Request: Remove existing stoop and build a new covered front porch while maintaining historical architectural of home.

Stuart & Debra Lutterloh were sworn to give testimony for the request.

Mr. Lutterloh informed the Commission that the original porch on the house he purchased had been removed and replaced with a stoop. He would like to remove the stoop and build a new front porch to restore the house back to its original look.

He testified that he will use a tumbled oversize brick for the foundation in order to maintain the old look with a slanted roof across the top. The roof will either be shingled to match the house or a standing seam metal roof which will match the color of the existing shingle. The posts will be 8 x8 and trimmed out with some type OG trim and corner molding; the material for the deck will be 5 ¼ x 6 treated deck boards. The ceiling will be a ¾ x 3” tongue and groove ceiling board that was common on most porches years ago. The balusters will be decorative, and painted White. The steps will be brick.

Kathy Walters informed Mr. Lutterloh that decking material is not appropriate for the flooring; instead suggested Tenduraplank, a 60 % wood tongue and groove material.

Mr. Lutterloh stated that he would not have a problem with that.

In response to a question from Judy Kandl, Mr. Lutterloh stated that the proposed columns are square rather than rounded.

Anne Lyles stated that square posts were accepted during the period of the bungalow.

In response to a question from Wendy Spry, Mr. Lutterloh stated that all trees would remain on the property.

There was no one present to speak in support or opposition to the request.

Ronald Fleming made the motion as follows: “I move that the Commission find the following facts concerning Application #H-20-07 – that Stuart and Debra Lutterloh, owners of 420 W. Bank St., appeared before the Commission and sought a Certificate of Appropriateness to remove the existing stoop and build a new covered front porch while maintaining the historical architecture of the home; that no one appeared before the Commission to support or oppose this request, this request should be granted based on the The Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation, and Chapter 2 – Changes to Buildings – Porches, Entrances and Balconies, pages 22-23, guidelines 1,3,7, and 13 of the Residential Historic District Design Guidelines;

there were no mitigating factors; therefore, I further move that a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application #H-20-07 be granted to Stuart and Debra Lutterloh, owners of 420 W. Bank St., to make changes detailed in the application with the following changes agreed to by the applicant: use tongue and groove Tonduraplane instead of porch decking for the porch construction.”

Jack Errante seconded the motion; all members present voted AYE.

H-21-07 604 N. Main St. – Charles Shuler, owner; Gray Stout, AIA, agent;
Request: Demolition of existing concrete block building.

Gray Stout was sworn to give testimony for the request.

Staff presented slides Mr. Stout described the dilapidated painted concrete block building requiring demolition in order to prepare the site for new construction. He testified that he was not sure of the date the building was constructed but it was probably in the 1950’s. The building is located in a local district and is not historically significant, he said.

There was no one present to speak in support or opposition to the request.

Susan Hurt made the following motion: “I move that the Commission find the following facts concerning Application #H-21-07 – that Charles Shuler, owner of 604 N. Main St., appeared through his agent, Gray Stout, before the Commission and sought a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish the existing concrete block building; that no one from the public appeared before the Commission to support or oppose this request, this request should be granted based on The Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation, and Chapter 5 Demolition or Relocation of Buildings – Demolition, pages 68-69, guidelines 1 and 2 of the Non-Residential Historic District Design Guidelines; mitigating factor is that the building is not historically significant; therefore, I further move that a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application #H-21-07 be granted to Charles Shuler, owner of 604 N. Main St. to make the changes detailed in the application.”

Jack Errante seconded the motion; all members present voted AYE.

H-07-07 602 N. Main St. – Charles Shuler, owner; Gray Stout, AIA,
Request: New building adjacent/connecting to existing Shuler Pool Company building.

Gray Stout presented plans for the construction of a new building adjacent to the existing Shuler Pool Company building; the two will be connected internally. He stated that the new building will be used for display of equipment and supplies and for additional office space.

Staff presented slides as Mr. Stout testified that there would be a 28” floor level change in the new building from the existing building entailing removal of the retaining wall and taking out a lot of dirt. He stated that the front entrance would have 3 risers because the sidewalk slopes up. The accessibility, he said, will be dealt with by having the parking in the rear and providing for a level entry into the back door. The front door will also be open and accessible to the public.

He presented the front elevations in order to show the proportion and scale in the context of the building in relation to Main St. and adjoining properties. He stated that although there are some offsets in the rear he wanted the parapet to set down as it went back.

He testified that there would be a high ceiling window space on the front which would be 8 ft. from the bottom of the awnings. A horizontal band, as is typically seen by the sidewalk on a storefront, will be located at the bottom of the windows to reference back to the panel. Gooseneck lights, he stated, will light the metal lettering that will be applied to the brick. The metal awnings will be similar to those in place on the Firehouse Loft - a corrugated metal prefinished in black with black frames. The storefront of the brick building will be black aluminum frame, 2" with clear glass. The steps from the sidewalk to the main building will be brick.

A sample of the Taylor Clay brick and the light fixtures were presented. In addition, color samples of the metal, the awning, and the storefront panel were presented.

He further testified that awnings will be located on the side and rear elevations.

In response to a question from Jack Errante, Mr. Stout stated that the height of the existing building on the high side is 15 ft. and 16 ½ ft. on the lower side. The height of the proposed new building is 16 ft. on the high side, and the lower side is 18.6 ft.

Judy Kandl complimented Mr. Stout for his precise application and renderings which will allow for an easier determination of compliance of the guidelines.

Mrs. Kandl also stated that Sect. 2.3 Side and Rear Facades - should be added to the list of guidelines for consideration.

There was no one present to speak in support or opposition of the request.

Anne Lyles made the motion as follows: "I move that the Commission find the following facts concerning Application #H-07-07 – that Gray Stout representing Charles Shuler, owner of 602 N. Main Street, appeared before the Commission and sought a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a new building adjacent and connecting to the existing Shuler Pool Company building; that no one appeared before the Commission to support or oppose this request, this request should be granted based on The Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation and Chapter 3 – New Construction & Additions, pages 46-49, guidelines 1-17 of the Non-Residential Historic District Design Guidelines, there were no mitigating factors; therefore, I further move that a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application #H-07-07 be granted to Charles Shuler, owner of 602 N. Main St., to make the changes detailed in the application."

Ronald Fleming seconded the motion; all members present voted AYE.

H-22-07 200 S. Main St. – Home Run Properties, LLC, owner –

Request: Replace existing upper story windows with 2/2 wood double hung windows to match the two original windows true divided lights on the side elevation; install iron window boxes on upper front elevation.

Upon Judy Kandl's request, Susan Hurt made a motion that Judy Kandl recuse herself for the request; Jack Errante seconded the motion and all members voted AYE.

Diane Young, agent for the applicant, was sworn to give testimony for the request.

Staff presented slides.

Diane Young testified that most of the windows consist of an arch-transom above 1/1 double hung wood windows; however, there are two 2/2 original windows, without the transom, located along the W. Fisher St. elevation.

Diane Young informed the Commission that she was in the process of preparing and filing an application to the state on behalf of the owner in order to utilize historic rehabilitation tax credits for the project, and has consulted with the State Preservation Office concerning the project. She read an email response from Tim Simmons, Tax Credits Coordinator, following an inspection which he had arranged through Paul Fomberg, by an area restoration specialist. Mr. Simmons stated that the upper façade windows were probably 2/2 and also stated that the transoms, which appear to be original, should remain. She testified that the owner may choose to retain the existing upper story windows and make repairs as needed; however, if the choice is to replace the sashes on the front and side she would like to use 2/2 so that they will more consistent with the 2 existing original windows.

In response to a question from Anne Lyles, Mrs. Young stated that the upper sash of the window would be fixed and the lower sash operable.

Mrs. Young presented a picture of the proposed 36" wide x 11 ½" deep window boxes. She said she did not know what the liner would be, when asked by Kathy Walters.

Anne Waters inquired whether the boxes would be displayed on Main Street only. Mrs. Young said she may elect to have them on both Main and Fisher St.

In reference to a question from Janet Gapen, Mrs. Young said she did not know how the owner planned to attach the boxes, and welcomed the Commission's guidance. Commission members agreed that they be attached into the mortar and not the brick.

There was no one present to speak in support or opposition to the request.

Ronald Fleming made the following motion: “I move that the Commission find the following facts concerning Application #H-22-07 – that Diane Young, agent for Home Run Properties, LLC, owner of 200 S. Main St., appeared before the Commission and sought a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the existing upper story windows with 2/2 wood double hung windows to match the 2 original windows with true divided lights on the side elevation, and install iron window boxes on the upper front and side elevations; that no one appeared before the Commission to support or oppose this request, this request should be granted based on The Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation and Chapter 2 Changes to Buildings – Windows and Doors, pages 30-31, guidelines 1,2,3,4 and 6 of the Non-Residential Historic District Design Guidelines; there are no mitigating factors; therefore, I further move that a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application #H-22-07 be granted to Diane Young, agent for Home Run Properties, LLC, owner of 200 S. Main Street, to make the changes detailed in the application with the following changes agreed to by the applicant: to place the iron window boxes directly into the mortar or hang from the lower window sash.”

Kathy Walters seconded the motion; all member present voted AYE.

Judy Kandl returned to her seat following a motion from Susan Hurt, seconded by Jack Errante and all members voting AYE.

Committee Reports

Minor works: There were no questions pertaining to the minor work approvals.

Janet Gapen:

- Gave out a revised members’ list to each member.
- Viewed the sign-up sheet for Preservation Month and asked members to let her know in what capacity they would like to volunteer.
- Informed members that the Local Legislature Bill, allowing the City Council to act as an additional layer of review for demolition in the down town, has been passed by the House of Representatives. The next review will be by the Senate.
- Distributed a copy of the *Alliance Review* was as information; also, a copy of the Code of Ethics as printed in the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions.
- Complimented Judy Kandl for the 3 different coloring sheets that she prepared for the coloring contest.
- Announced the dedication of the new NC State Highway historical marker that will be located in front of the Rowan County Office Building at 402 N. Main St. in honor of Henry Cowan on Tuesday, May 22nd. A reception will follow at Mt. Zion Baptist Church.

- Informed members that the Planning Board will consider a text amendment to the Zoning Ordinance that will give greater flexibility for reconstructing historic signs. More information will be brought to the Commission before the Planning Board votes.
- Inquired if members would be interested in participating in training sessions based on various topics. This training would be similar to a session conducted last year by Susan Hurt on meeting procedures, motions, appeals, etc.

All members present were interested; dates will be discussed at a later time.

Minutes

Consideration of the April minutes was deferred to the next meeting.

Adjournment

There being no other business to come before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 7:35 p.m. by the Chairman.

Wayne Whitman, Chairman

Judy Jordan, Secretary